How HUAC Lies About Its Paid Informers, P. 2

Not Worth Much in Battle But They'll Provide Glorious LBJ Headlines From Manila

"Any commitments [of more Asian troops at Manila] would surely involve only a token number of troops of dubious military value. U.S. officers recall wryly that upon their arrival in Vietnam Philippine security troops, who were sent to protect the Filipino combat engineers already there, in turn had to be protected by U.S. forces. Yet even these contributions would dramatize Allied support for President Johnson's Asian policy and thus provide a psychological lift. . . . Aside from the Korean and Australian forces U.S. officials regard the Asian military contributions in Vietnam as nearly more bother than they are worth."

—Wall Street Journal, Oct. 21.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. XIV, NO. 34 October 31, 1966 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

Ho Chi Johnson Mobilizes Little Old New Asia

Honolulu was dreamed up to distract attention from the Fulbright hearings; Manila, to get Johnson off the hook of that exuberant promise last July to campaign in all 50 States. Too many Democratic candidates had suggested that they might do better if he stayed away. How keep Johnson on the front pages and the TV screens in the meantime? The Republicans provided the idea for an Asia peace conference. So we have had this magnificent Madison avenue charade; Johnson, crossing the Pacific with giant strides in the search for peace, high above partisan politics, and even turning up for the camera men with his troops in Vietnam on the Frontiers of Freedom. The trip has been a public relations man's dream, an immensely successful travelling rodeo.

Only Two Days of The Seventeen

True, Manila has not exactly been a peace conference. How, as Goldwater, that innocent, asked on TV last Monday, do you have a peace conference when the other side isn't there? Nor has it been a war conference. It is hard to see what kind of a conference it has been, except a conference to get Johnson's picture with all those Asian potentates. The schedule is indicative. Of 17 days allotted to the trip, barely two were devoted to the conference itself. There was hardly time to read much less debate the 3,000 words of the triple pronunciamentoes prefabricated for it: The Goals of Freedom, the Communique, and the Declaration on Peace and Progress in Asia and the Pacific. The verbiage was familiar State Department prose garnished with Johnsonian evangelism about "men and nations" having "no choice but to live together like brothers." There's nothing like a little old-time religion while Cain bombs the hell out of Abel.

The heart of the three documents, the signal—as diplomats say—is "former enemies are asked only to lay down their weapons." This is our friend from World War II, unconditional surrender. No peace conference, no negotiations, are necessary. If North Vietnam stops helping the rebels and the rebels give up, we are willing to stop fighting, too. To this magnificent offer to let them surrender, there was added —"for dramatic effect", as one U.S. official explained to the press—a promise that six months after, our troops will be withdrawn. If the other side does not accept this, we step up the bombings and pour in more troops. As Johnson said at Canberra, "we cannot tire of sacrifice until peace comes to Vietnam." LBJ is the world's most indefatigable pacifist.

The SEP on Auschwitz and Vietnam

"It can easily be said there is no connection between Auschwitz and Vietnam. . . . The fact remains that in this 'just' struggle against Communism, we are killing civilians as surely as any Communist ever did. Our bombs drop on friend and foe alike; our napalm burns them alive, friend and enemy. . . .We are certainly not Nazis. We provide doctors to treat the children we have bombed. We hold 'elections' so we can reassure ourselves of popular support. And we promise that some day we will provide money to rebuild the land we are destroying. But what if the end does not justify the means? . . . What if no future form of 'freedom' can ever make up for the pain being inflicted now? Some strategists say the Vietnamese must suffer their role as pawns . . . [in] the containment of Communism on a global scale. . . . It is a harsh doctrine, not unlike shooting a few hostages to make the rest of the population behave. . . . Some day we will wonder why we keep on being sheep."

—Saturday Evening Post *editorial, Oct. 22.*

There is hardly a phrase in the creamy prose of the Manila documents which is not an affront. Asia, the Continent of the Coolie, where the poor have been miserable and despised since human time began, is described as having "a rich heritage of the intrinsic worth and dignity of every man!" The signers are symbols of everything Asia's poor have been rebelling against: Australia and New Zealand, which bar the brown and yellow man from their empty spaces to keep them white men's preserves; the military dictators of three small Asian countries where the rich landowners and merchants look to U.S. support to keep them going a little longer; the leader of the fantastically corrupt Filipino oligarchy, whose islands are another U.S. military outpost. These peripheral pygmies precariously poised on the edges of a giant Continent in eruption are orchestrated by a Texan as the voice of the New Asia. Only in America could anybody get away with such cosmic nonsense

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Wayne Hays Discloses That Witnesses Were Secretly Paid by "Consultant" Contracts

Plain and Fancy Lying by HUAC Members in the Debate on the Chicago Cases

The House debate Oct. 18 on HUAC's Chicago contempt citations were noteworthy for two reasons. The first is that on a motion to recommit there were 90 votes against the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the highest ever in a vote against a contempt citation. The entire Chicago delegation voted against HUAC (the vote was 90 to 181 with 161 not voting). The three cited were Dr. Jeremiah Stamler, director of the heart disease control program of the Chicago Board of Health; his research assistant, Mrs. Yolanda Hall and social worker Milton Cohen. Dr. Stamler's eminence in his field evoked a petition of protest from doctors, scientists and lawyers which filled over 21 pages of the Congressional Record *in agate type. The second important aspect of the debate were the false and misleading replies given by members of HUAC when Rep. Wayne Hays (D. Ohio) asked whether HUAC was secretly paying witnesses by giving them "consultant" contracts. We give the record here in abridged form:*

Mr. HAYS (*D. Ohio*): Will the gentleman inform me as to whether these so-called witnesses were paid by the committee, or were under contract to the committee and paid in that fashion?

Mr. WELTNER (*D. Ga.*): The two witnesses were Lola Belle Holmes and Lucious Armstrong who, as the hearings elicited, had previously maintained some relationship with the FBI. To the best of my knowledge, information and belief, there was no contract or remuneration with regard to these two.

A Gentleman's Word

Mr. HAYS: I am glad to take the gentleman's word that they were not paid.

Mr. WELTNER: I am not stating that, if the gentleman please, I am stating that I have no knowledge or information of any kind of remuneration or compensation to these witnesses with regard to Milton Mitchell Cohen.

Mr. HAYS: The gentleman is aware, however, Mr. Speaker, that in times past the House Committee on Un-American Activities has paid witnesses and has used the device of putting them under contract to keep their names from the public records?

Mr. WELTNER: I have no knowledge of such a practice.

Mr. HAYS: *I will tell the gentleman that I have signed contracts which I have been told as chairman of the Contract Committee, was a device to keep these witnesses' names off the public payroll.* [Italic added.]

Mr. WILLIS (*D. La.*, Chairman of HUAC): There should be no payment. I regret to say that I do not know what the gentleman is talking about.

What If They Are Communists?

Mrs. Yolanda Hall, Dr. Stamler's research assistant, appeared as a defense witness in the 1949 Smith Act trials of Communist Party leaders and then stated that she was a Communist. HUAC claims that Communist meetings were held in Dr. Stamler's home until 1958 when he became director of the heart disease control program at the Chicago Board of Health. What if Dr. Stamler and his assistant were or are Communists? He is one of the great men in this field. What do their politics have to do with heart disease? Why should their work be disrupted? The United States is the only country in the "free world" (except West Germany and South Africa) where Communists are outlawed or hounded. These are the deeper questions raised by the Chicago cases.

Mr. HAYS: You mean to say that you never heard of committee contracts?

Mr. WILLIS: I might say of course we have people under contract as consultants. But that is not talking about witnesses. My goodness, that has never been indulged in.

Mr. HAYS: The gentleman never had a witness under contract or gave him a contract because he was a witness?

Mr. WILLIS: Perhaps as a consultant, I do not know, but not as a witness. And not a dime was ever paid to any witness to procure evidence, or anything of the sort.

Mr. HAYS: They have been put under contract after they testified.

Hays two days later put into the *Congressional Record* (Appendix, Oct. 20, p. 5454) a list of HUAC contracts over the past six years totalling more than $35,000. The first on the list, Philip Luce, was given his $1,000 contract just six days after he turned up Aug. 16 as a "friendly witness" against his former comrades in the Progressive Labor Party. The others listed by Hays were:

1966: Geo H. Lynch, Oct. 11, $3,000. 1965: John Sullivan, June 25, $3,600; Wm. Hendrix, July 2, $250; Geo. H. Lynch, Aug. 20, $3,000; John D. Sullivan, Sept. 2, $3,600, Dec. 28, $3,600. 19644: Margaret Ann Kerr, Aug. 24, $800; Andrew J. Berecz, Oct. 2, $200; Chas. S. Weatherholt, Oct 2, $378.59; Geo. H. Lynch, Jan. 2, $4,500. 1963: John Santo, Mar. 14, $2,500; Geo. H. Lynch, July 17, $1,000; Margaret Ann Kerr, July 17, $1,800; John Lautner, Dec. 11, $1,000; Herbert Romerstein, Dec. 11, $1,000. 1962: Ruth Taylor Hunter, Feb. 1, $1,800. 1961: Maurice Malkin, June 8, $400; Lillian E. Howard, May 3, $1,800.

Elizabeth Bentley Got $100 A Day—HUAC Also Keeps Files on Congressmen

Wayne Hays (D. Ohio) *in the House Oct. 18:*

"Let me recite a little history. When I came to this body 18 years ago, there was a big Democratic class. The only committee assignment I could get, unfortunately, was on the House Administration Committee. The first thing brought to that committee that caused any trouble was a big bill to pay a woman, whose name, if I recall correctly, was Elizabeth Bentley. It was for $100 a day. And that was a lot of money back in those days, if I remember correctly, for staying over at the Congressional in a big suite—and the meals ran pretty high, too. Being a country boy, I was not used to that kind of high living then, and I questioned it a little bit. Some of the people on the Committee on Un-American Activities have had it in their nose for me ever since. And I get reports from time to time of some of the holier-than-thou staff people who have such a big file on Members of the Congress."

These are important footnotes for the history of the witch hunt. This is the first time it was ever revealed that Elizabeth Bentley, who ranked second only to Whitaker Chambers among the sensational informers of the 40s, was paid $100 a day by HUAC. This is to be read in the light of an affidavit published in this *Weekly* Jan. 16, 1956, by defense counsel in a libel suit brought by one of the men she smeared. The affidavit said that Miss Bentley in a pre-trial interrogation in Louisiana said her book "Out of Bondage", based on her HUAC testimony, was fictional rather than factual. The victim won his suit.

We suggest that when the new Congress convenes, some member demand to know the full truth about Hay's further revelation—that HUAC keeps files on members of Congress. This is what got McCarthy into trouble in the Senate.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Faceless? So Were The European Resistance Leaders Against The Nazis

Bernard Fall's Reply to CIA-Man George Carver on "The Faceless Viet Cong"

Without disclosing the fact that George A. Carver, Jr., is a CIA man, Foreign Affairs Quarterly last April published his article, "The Faceless Viet Cong." In its new Fall issue, it published a reply by Dr. Bernard B. Fall, author of The Two Vietnams. We give the gist of it here because we believe the issues are of urgent relevance to any negotiated settlement of the war.

By Dr. Bernard B. Fall

It can be conceded that any Communist member of the National Liberation Front in South Viet Nam is a member of the *Lao Dong*, the Vietnamese Communist Party, and that North Viet Nam, which had won the war against France in 1954, fully expected to gain control of South Viet Nam as well either by the elections slated for July 1956 or at a later date. I am, however, inclined to doubt that Hanoi's decision to intervene was prompted by any "increasing disparity between political life north and south." For it became obvious even to the blindest of optimists that, unfortunately, the political lives of both Viet Nams, far from becoming "disparate," began to resemble each other as only two extremes can, with their gradual falsification of representative processes and, finally, with their concentration camps and persecution of religious groups. The existence of a "Central Reunification Department" in Hanoi of which much is made is surely revelatory of something—until one becomes aware that West Germany, for example, has a Ministry for All-German Affairs to which, of course, East Germany and the Soviets ascribe equally sinister motives, even though it can be safely assumed that the *Ministerium für Gesamtdeutsche Fragen* is more innocuous than any Hanoi committee with the same purpose.

The Repression Came First

It is likewise very much open to question that the intervention of Hanoi was first evidenced by a terror campaign directed against small South Vietnamese officials. In actual fact, Diem began to become oppressive as early as January 1956, when a concentration camp ordinance (No. 6 of January 11, 1956) gave the régime almost unchecked power to deal with the opposition—and the non-Communist opposition, least inured to clandestine operations, was hit hardest.

The decision by Diem—probably his most pregnant in terms of its future consequences—to abolish elected village government in June 1956 did the rest. The hated appointees became a prime target for local resentment and by March 1958 over 400 had been murdered by guerrillas who indeed, as Carver points out, "harped on local issues and avoided preaching Marxist doctrine." When it is remembered that there were enough "local issues" around to cause the South Vietnamese Army itself to try at least three times to murder Diem, it becomes understandable why South Viet Nam appeared to Hanoi ripe for plucking. In other words, there can be no doubt but that Hanoi, or even South Vietnamese stay-behind Communist elements, took advantage of Saigon's glaring weaknesses after 1959. But the Communists can hardly be held responsible for the incredible stupidity of the Diem régime and the somewhat surprising blindness to its faults of its American advisers.

The next point which requires clarification is *not* whether insurgency in South Viet Nam is abetted, directed and aided from North Viet Nam (it is to a large extent), but whether such outside controls preclude the existence of *real* objectives which are specifically those of the insurgents rather than of their external sponsors. Here, the recent British revelations as to the truly enormous extent of the control of the French Resistance in France by the Special Operations Executive (S.O.E.)—the 1940-1946 British equivalent of the Central Intelligence Agency—shows what is meant. According to the now-published official history of S.O.E. in France, "till 1944 the British had a virtual monopoly over all of de Gaulle's means of communications with France," and the French "could not introduce a single agent or a single store" without Allied permission and help, and "anything [they] planned with marked political implications was liable to be vetoed by any of the three major Western allies." Yet, having substantiated exactly what both the Vichy French and the Nazis had said all along, *i.e.* that the French Resistance was nothing but an "Anglo-Saxon conspiracy" and the resisters (this writer included) nothing but foreign agents, the official history makes the key point: "All these victories by and through resistance forces in France had a common basis: overwhelming popular support."

In spite of overwhelming technical control by the Allies, de Gaulle succeeded in winning political and military loyalty among the diverse guerrilla forces in France, and even de Gaulle's own views and desires had to acommodate themselves to those developed by the internal resistance in its four-year fight, in which it bore the brunt of the struggle and suffered the bulk of the losses. The differences of view between Viet Cong leaders who have now been in the fight for six years (and some of them for twenty!) and the Hanoi theoreticians and conventional military commanders go in many cases far beyond normal internecine party struggles or mere disagreements.

It is easy to dismiss those differences as being mere camouflage (after all, some people believe that the Sino-Soviet split is nothing but a grand deception foisted on the easily-fooled West) and to believe the N.L.F. is indeed nothing but "a contrived political mechanism with no indigenous roots," as Carver avers. But in that case, the 220,000 Viet Cong who fight side-by-side with 50,000 PAVN regulars, and who over the past three years are said to have suffered almost 100,000 dead and 182,000 wounded, fight rather well for what must be a vast mass of remote-controlled and force-drafted recruits. Otherwise, desertion would be just as easy on the Viet Cong side as it is on the ARVN side.

That leaves, lastly, the argument of "facelessness": the N.L.F. leaders are men of little stature in their own society; they are unknowns. But four years ago only a few Vietnamese military men knew who General Ky was, and no one thought of him even two years ago as being of presidential timber. Aside from Jugoslavia's Marshal Tito, it takes real expertise to recall the names of European resistance leaders. In any case, N.L.F. propaganda has seen to it that its leaders should not remain anonymous: at least forty senior leaders' biographies have been published, along with their photos. Their background shows the normal social background of Vietnamese leadership in general, from medical doctors and pharmacists, to lawyers and even army officers (though the sprinkling of Montagnards and women is more typical of the likewise classic "united front" picture). And they have one remarkable common charateristic *which thus far no Saigon government has been able to match: they are all from south of the seventeenth parallel.*

None of the foregoing justifies Hanoi's claim that the N.L.F. should be the "sole legitimate voice of the South Vietnamese people." But nothing justifies the opposite claim either, to the effect that without Hanoi's full support, the N.L.F. would disappear into thin air like a desert mirage. There can indeed be no quarrel with Carver's statement that "the Viet Cong organization is unquestionably a major factor in the South Vietnamese political scene." In that case, however, it must be treated as what it is—a political force in South Viet Nam which cannot be simply blasted off the surface of the earth with B-52 saturation raids, or told to pack up and go into exile to North Viet Nam.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The White House and The Tax Lobbyists Pull Off A Coup as Congress Adjourns

A Collection of Tricky Tax Steals Plus A Huge Slush Fund for LBJ

The closing hours of a session are those chosen by lobbyists and their friends in Congress to run through special interest legislation—most notoriously sugar and tax bills—when members are in a hurry to adjourn. The closing hours of Congress last Saturday were no exception. The only difference this time: the biggest lobbyist of all was the White House. The result is a measure which will give Johnson $30 to $40 million for his reelection campaign in 1968, in addition to what he can raise from private sources.

A Gore and Williams Battle

Gore of Tennessee and Williams of Delaware fought a last minute battle in an effort to defeat what the former called a grab-bag of "stark tax favors" and "a dangerous innovation in the use of public money for political campaigns." The vehicle for this slick series of raids on the Treasury was a bill which as originally passed by the House provided certain tax favors to encourage foreign investment in the U.S.

To this the Senate proceeded to attach a number of amendments. Several—which provided a humanitarian smokescreen—were an effort to help elderly folk meet medical and other expenses. But by the time the bill emerged from conference committee and was ready for final passage every item designed to help the elderly had been traded off and deleted in favor of special interest tax legislation. One sample was an obscure technical amendment which turned out to give $2 million to Harvey Aluminum Company; three members of the Harvey family (Sen. Williams disclosed) belong to the President's $1,000 Club and the company itself took a $15,000 ad in a 1965 Democratic party book. Gore opposed this provision, though Harvey operates in Tennessee.

Another sample is a provision which will enable 11 new investment funds to be used as a device for a "swap" of some $300,000,000 in securities without paying capital gains taxes. Another will give depletion allowances on oyster shells; the Treasury, Williams joked bitterly, might as logically give depletion allowances on oysters and lobsters! Another gift on this Christmas tree bill would double the tax benefits to self-employed professional men; half of this will go to persons with incomes over $25,000. All these special tax privileges were handed out on the eve of an expected sharp rise in taxes to meet the growing costs of the Vietnamese war.

Gore and Williams focused their fire on a provision which allows taxpayers to check off $1 each on their income taxes to finance presidential campaigns. A sum equal to the votes cast in the previous presidential election minus 10,000,000 will be divided equally at the next election between the two major parties. (Originally minority parties which polled in excess of 1,500,000 votes were to get $1 for each vote over that number, but in conference this was changed to 5,000,000. No third party has polled that big a vote; even La Follette in 1924 and Teddy Roosevelt in 1912 fell short of it.) This provision is expected to produce anywhere from $60 to $80 million. Its vague terms will enormously increase the power of the President to succeed himself and perhaps to name his successor.

A Tax Referendum on The Vietnam War?

"If the precedent [of allowing income tax payers to check off $1 for presidential campaign expenses] should be held constitutional, which I doubt, then it would be a dangerous one and, ere long, this tax form which we have sought to simplify would have a number of boxes on it. Suppose we had a box giving a taxpayer the election of whether any part of his funds could be used in the Vietnam war? There are a number of pacifists in this country who stoutly contend that it is immoral and illegal to require them to pay taxes to support a war which is contrary to their religious or moral concepts. The Senator from Vermont [Aiken] made a novel suggestion, that the way to end the Vietnam war was for the Senate to pass a resolution declaring that the U.S. had won the war. . . . I found it amusing, as I am sure the author did, with his fine sense of humor, but I do not think it would be humorous at all to have a referendum of American taxpayers declaring whether their funds should be used in the Vietnam war."

—Gore (D. Tenn.) *in the Senate Oct. 22.*

We'll Be Glad to Send A Sample Copy of This Issue To A Friend — Send A Stamped Addressed Envelope
Also PLEASE Send in Your Zip Numbers Urgent

I. F. Stone's Weekly 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20015

Please renew (or enter) a sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City ..... Zip..... State.....

1/31/66

For the enclosed $5 send a gift sub to:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City ..... Zip..... State.....

For $5.35 extra send I. F. Stone's *The Haunted Fifties*
Indicate if announcement wished ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20015

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every Monday except in August, the last week in December and the first week in January and Bi-Weekly during July at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N.W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U.S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED